

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



MC

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	. FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/661,459	. (09/13/2000	Morikatsu Matsuda	000004.000661	2151		
27557	7590	12/17/2002					
		MISKY & MCCA	EXAM	EXAMINER			
	STREET, N GTON, DC	I.W., SUITE 1000 20006		GOODMAN	GOODMAN, CHARLES		
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/661,459	MATSUDA ET AL.	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Examin r	Art Unit	
	Charles Goodman	3724	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 27 November 2002 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to available rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control	ation. A proper repl	y to a ation in
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period cee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the approper of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension ropriate extension Office action: or
 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>27 November 2002</u>. 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be 	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	within the period se f the appeal.	t forth in
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further		see NOTE below):	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•	, , ,	
(c) ⊠ they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	,	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancell	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	s.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:	reconsideration has been consi	dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 10 and 12-16.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Exami	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·	
0. Other:		of the of	
		HARLES GOOD!	



Continuation of 2. NOTE: In claim 10, the phrase "so that the workpiece (W)...device (69)" was not earlier presented and requires further v consideration; thus raising new issues.